

## FAIR self assessment for project: Institutionally supported policy and data infrastructure to ensure management and reusability of sensitive imaging data through controlled access using XNAT

| Questions for each FAIR component ↓ |  | Answer options: Increasingly FAIR -->                   |                                |  |   |  |
|-------------------------------------|--|---|--------------------------------|--|---|--|
| <b>FINDABLE</b>                     |  |   |                                |  |   |  |
| Q1                                  | Does the dataset have any identifiers assigned?  | No identifier   | Local identifier               | Web address (URL)  | Globally unique, citable and persistent identifier (e.g. DOI, PURL, or Handle)                              |  |
| A1                                  | Start of project   |   | YES (e.g.,)                    |  |   |  |
|                                     | End of project   |   | YES (e.g.,) (DOI's on roadmap) |  |   |  |
|                                     | Two years time   |   |                                |  |   |  |
| Q2                                  | Is the identifier included in all metadata records or metadata files describing the data?  | No  | Yes                            |  |   |  |
| A2                                  | Start of project   |   | yes                            |  |   |  |
|                                     | End of project   |   |                                |  |   |  |
|                                     | Two years time   |   |                                |  |   |  |
| Q3                                  | Is the data described by a metadata record?  | The data is not described                               | Brief title and description    | Brief title and description, and multiple other fields filled out, albeit briefly. | Comprehensively (a min metadata template will be provided) using a formal machine-readable metadata schema. |  |
| A3                                  | Start of project   |   | yes                            |  |   |  |
|                                     | End of project   |   |                                |  |   |  |
|                                     | Two years time   |   |                                |  |   |  |
| Q4                                  | What type of repository or registry is the metadata record in?   | The data is not described in any registry or repository | Local institutional repository | Domain-specific repository   | Generalist public repository  | Data is in one place but discoverable through several places (i.e. other registries, RDA, Google Data Search)                                  |
| A4                                  | Start of project   |   | Yes                            |  |   |  |
|                                     | End of project   |   |                                |  |   |  |
|                                     | Two years time   |   |                                |  |   |  |
| <b>ACCESSIBLE</b>                   |  |   |                                |  |   |  |
| Q5                                  | How accessible is the data? Note: The access method (s) must be explicitly stated in the metadata record, e.g. if any authentication is needed, or there are any restrictions to access. | No metadata record                                      | Access to metadata only        | Unspecified access conditions e.g. "contact the data custodian to discuss access"  | Embargoed access after a specified date; or A deidentified version of the data is publicly accessible       | Fully accessible public, or to persons who meet and follow explicitly stated conditions and processes, e.g. ethics approval for sensitive data |
| A5                                  | Start of project   | no publicly viewable metadata                           |                                |  |   | authorised individuals can access  |
|                                     | End of project   |   |                                |  |   |  |
|                                     | Two years time   |   |                                |  |   |  |
| Q6                                  | Is the data available online without requiring specialised protocols or tools once access has been approved?   | No access to data                                       | By individual arrangement      | File download from online location   | Non-standard web service (e.g. OpenAPI/Swagger/informal API)  | Standard web service API (e.g. OGC)  |
| A6                                  | Start of project   |   |                                |  |   | Yes RESTful API  |
|                                     | End of project   |   |                                |  |   |  |
|                                     | Two years time   |   |                                |  |   |  |

|                      |   |  |   |  |  |  |
|----------------------|---|--|---|--|--|--|
| Q7                   | Does the repository/registry agree to maintain the persistence of the metadata record, even if the data product is no longer available?   | No (or not applicable, if no metadata record exists)   | Unsure  | Yes  |  |  |
| A7                   | Start of project  |  | <i>Data unclear</i>   | Yes for project metadata   |  |  |
|                      | End of project  |  |   |  |  |  |
|                      | Two years time  |  |   |  |  |  |
| <b>INTEROPERABLE</b> |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Q8                   | Are the data available in (an) open (file) format(s)?   | Data are mostly available only in a proprietary format   | Data are available in an open format  | Data are available in an open, documented, widely-used standard format (i.e. NetCDF, CSV, JSON, XML, etc)                            |  |  |
| A8                   | Start of project  |  |   | <i>yes. per NIF TDR</i>  |  |  |
|                      | End of project  |  |   |  |  |  |
|                      | Two years time  |  |   |  |  |  |
| Q9                   | Are the data is machine readable?   | The data are unstructured  | The data are structured and machine-readable (i.e. csv, JSON, XML, RDF, database files, etc)  |  |  |  |
| A9                   | Start of project  |  | <i>Yes</i>  |  |  |  |
|                      | End of project  |  |   |  |  |  |
|                      | Two years time  |  |   |  |  |  |
| Q10                  | What best describes the types of vocabularies/ontologies/tagging schemas used to define the data elements?  | Data elements are not described (i.e. fields or objects are labelled with codes or not at all) | Data elements are described (so that a human user can correctly interpret the data), but no standards have been used in the description | Recognised standards have been used in the description of data elements, but no published vocabularies with resolvable URIs are used | Published vocabularies using resolvable identifiers linking to explanations are used, so that the data can be read and understood by machines as well as humans. | Published vocabularies using <b>persistent</b> resolvable identifiers linking to explanations are used, so that the data can be read and understood by machines as well as humans. |
| A10                  | Start of project  |  |   |  |  | <i>Yes (DICOM)</i>   |
|                      | End of project  |  |   |  |  |  |
|                      | Two years time  |  |   |  |  |  |
| Q11                  | How is the relationship to other data and resources (e.g. related datasets, services, publications, etc) described in the metadata, to provide context around the data?                     | There are no links to other metadata or data   | The metadata record includes URI links to related metadata, data and definitions  | Qualified links to other resources are recorded in a machine readable format, e.g. a linked data format such as RDF                  |  |  |
| A11                  | Start of project  | <i>None</i>  |   |  |  |  |
|                      | End of project  |  |   |  |  |  |
|                      | Two years time  |  |   |  |  |  |
| <b>REUSABLE</b>      |   |  |   |  |  |  |
| Q12                  | Which of the following best describes the license (usage rights) attached to the data?  | No license is applied  | Non-standard license applied, without a license deed URL encoded in a machine-readable format (e.g. RDF/XML) in the metadata record     | Non-standard license applied, WITH the license deed URL encoded in a machine-readable format (e.g. RDF/XML) in the metadata record   | Standard license applied (e.g. Creative Commons), without a license deed URL encoded in a machine-readable format (e.g. RDF/XML) in the metadata record          | Standard license applied (e.g. Creative Commons), WITH the license deed URL encoded in a machine-readable format (e.g. RDF/XML) in the metadata record                             |
| A12                  | Start of project  | <i>No license is applied, Terms of Use limits risk to Sydney.</i>                              |   |  |  |  |
|                      | End of project  |  |   |  |  |  |
|                      | Two years time  |  |   |  |  |  |
| Q13                  | How much provenance information has been captured to facilitate data reuse? i.e. project objectives, data generation/collection (including from external sources) and processing workflows. | No provenance information is recorded  | Partially recorded  | Comprehensively recorded in a text format (i.e. TXT or PDF)  | Comprehensively recorded in a machine readable format (i.e. in metadata record's schema or PROV, or in RDF, JSON, NetCDF, XML, etc)                              |  |

|     |                  |  |  |  |   |  |
|-----|------------------|--|--|--|---|--|
| A13 | Start of project | No provenance information is recorded against file types that are not DICOM... |  |  | Per NIF TDR, injected into DICOM Standard |  |
|     | End of project   |  |  |  |   |  |
|     | Two years time   |  |  |  |   |  |